

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK**

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 20, 2005*

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to participate in the following votes on October 19, 2005. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

On rollcall vote No. 529, on agreeing to Jackson-Lee of Texas amendment to H.R. 554—the “Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act of 2005,” I would have voted “no.”

On rollcall vote No. 530, on agreeing to Filner of California amendment to H.R. 554—the “Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act of 2005,” I would have voted “no.”

On rollcall vote No. 531 on agreeing to Scott of Virginia amendment to H.R. 554—the “Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act of 2005,” I would have voted “no.”

On rollcall vote No. 532, on agreeing to Waxman of California amendment to H.R. 554—the “Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act of 2005,” I would have voted “no.”

On rollcall vote No. 533, on passage of H.R. 554—the “Personal Responsibility in Food Consumption Act of 2005,” I would have voted “yes.”

**THE ERITREA-ETHIOPIA BORDER  
DISPUTE NEEDS AMERICAN  
LEADERSHIP**

**HON. DANA ROHRBACHER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 20, 2005*

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, the United States and Ethiopia have a long diplomatic history. It is a place that many Americans are familiar with.

Next door to Ethiopia spreading out along the strategic Red Sea coastline is Eritrea, a relatively new country, and a place that few Americans seem to fully understand.

The United States wants to have a good relationship with both Ethiopia and Eritrea. However, bilateral ties with both are weak and deteriorating.

This situation can be corrected, but it will take more interest and involvement by senior leaders in the U.S. government.

Congress is doing its part.

Chairman CHRIS SMITH and Representative DON PAYNE of the Africa subcommittee have held hearings on the border dispute earlier this year and have recently traveled to the region.

Last year Congress passed Senate-originated legislation, which became law, restricting assistance to Ethiopia or Eritrea for non-compliance to the Eritrea-Ethiopia Border Commission findings. Unfortunately, in January 2005, the executive branch waived this provision on national security grounds. I say “unfortunately” because it is because of our national security interest that the provision should have been kept in place. Uncertainty on the border issue creates uncertainty in the region.

Members have written letters to Secretary Rice and President Bush. We have urged

them to clarify our policy and to become engaged in this increasingly volatile part of the world. The responses from the State Department have been unhelpful and lead us to believe that either there is no policy, or the policy is to apply political pressure on Eritrea until there is war—and then blame Eritrea for not compromising with Ethiopia—or continuously pressure Eritrea until they agree to renegotiate the final and binding decision of the EEBC.

From Eritrea’s perspective, everything depends on full implementation of the EEBC decisions. The U.S. supposedly supports the EEBC decisions, but if it does, then its support appears to be very weak.

The U.S. policy, whatever it is, has one clear result: the status quo remains in place.

Unfortunately, the status quo is untenable and will ultimately result in a renewal of hostilities. The current stalemate is clearly driving the region towards war.

The border demarcation crisis is an existential threat to the security of Eritrea. The dialogue and discussion now being requested by Ethiopia has already occurred and is articulated by the EEBC. This fact underlies Eritrea’s unwillingness to dialogue further with Ethiopia or with U.N. Special Envoy Lloyd Axworthy on border demarcation. The failure to resolve the border impacts all aspects of thinking in Eritrea. Eritrea believes that protecting the security and sovereignty of the nation is the first responsibility of the government.

Let me make one thing perfectly clear: Ethiopian troops are occupying sovereign Eritrean territory today and have done so for years.

Because Eritrea is a small developing country the current situation puts into effect enormous internal pressures. But Eritrea will not compromise its national sovereignty, and will instead invoke the right to self-defense as articulated in Article 51 of the U.N. Charter and move to secure its territory by force as the international community fails to implement and enforce the rule of law and U.N. Security Council resolutions.

I am confident that if President Bush knew the details of this situation personally, that he would be very disappointed in the officials responsible for this weak policy. It does not reflect the President’s love for freedom and justice. Our policy leads nowhere but to war. That is unacceptable.

Someone has this problem figured out wrong. Today’s approach mirrors the thinking of the Clinton Administration. One wonders where the Republican appointees are in the policy-making process concerning this part of the world.

There is active discussion among Members about potential solutions. One common aspect of all potential courses of action is that more U.S. leadership is needed.

U.S. leadership makes a difference. Clear policy statements by President Bush and other senior officials preceded Charles Taylor leaving Liberia, Syrian troops leaving Lebanon, Israeli settlements leaving Gaza, Viktor Yushchenko’s election as President in Ukraine and so many other recent developments.

China is paying attention to this region. Sudan has thousands of PRC advisors working in the oil and gas business as well as military advisors. China is rapidly expanding its relationship with Ethiopia and Eritrea. These relationships with China will falter over time, but right now Beijing seems to be paying at-

tention to the Horn of Africa and we appear to be asleep at the switch. Someone at the State Department needs to wake up before it is too late.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress is calling on the Administration to make a clear statement of our policy on the Eritrea-Ethiopia border demarcation issue. A clear statement urging Ethiopia to unconditionally and swiftly implement the EEBC’s final and binding decision will set in motion positive forces that enable success. Further, such clarity would go a long way to starting a process that would very likely resolve this knotty border matter through a peaceful and diplomatic process rather than by more bloodshed.

**INTRODUCTION OF THE ENERGY  
PRICE DISCIPLINE ACT OF 2005**

**HON. FRANK A. LOBIONDO**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 20, 2005*

Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the “Energy Price Discipline Act of 2005.” This timely and important piece of legislation will ensure that the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has the tools to investigate and strongly prosecute price gouging across the nation by those refining, selling, or shipping crude oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, natural gas, or petroleum distillates.

Today, Americans are paying more than ever before for the fuel they need to run their cars and heat their homes. Even before the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, consumers were paying almost a dollar more than they were a year ago for a gallon of gas. And in the days following this disaster, average gas price rose an additional 45 cents per gallon—with reported prices of nearly \$6.00 at some stations in the affected areas.

And, as the days get shorter and the air gets colder, more and more people are worrying about how they are going to be able to heat their homes this winter. According to figures released last week by the U.S. Energy Information Administration, households heating their homes with natural gas can expect to spend about 48 percent more, or an additional \$350, on fuel this winter. Those with heating oil can expect a 32 percent increase, or on average about \$378 more.

But as Americans look deeper into their wallets to put gas in their cars to get to work or to heat their homes, both oil companies and U.S. refineries are on track for record profits. I believe that consumers across the country should have the right to know that the prices they are struggling to pay are legitimate and that no one is profiting unjustly at their expense.

For this reason, I am introducing the “Energy Price Discipline Act of 2005.” This bill will give the FTC broad discretion to investigate and, if necessary, strongly prosecute whoever—whether it is a gas station owner, a petroleum company, or a refiner—is guilty of manipulating the price of crude oil, gasoline, diesel fuel, natural gas, or petroleum distillates.

The “Energy Price Discipline Act of 2005” recognizes that in today’s global economy consumers in states far removed from a tragedy like Hurricane Katrina may see the results of it in their energy prices—often for legitimate